



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Such an interpretation cannot fairly be put upon the words used in the debates. Neither did Robespierre argue that men who possessed property greater in amount than any individual's share in the common fund ought to be prosecuted as monopolists.

In the description of the conspiracy of Babeuf the attempt to create the impression that this ridiculous adventurer was a real continuator of Robespierre breaks down. He was a travesty, hardly more. And it is doubtful whether the ex-Jacobins, who allied themselves with him in their desire to restore the constitution of 1793, would have listened to his declamations if the victory had been won.

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that writers like M. Espinas are influenced in their interpretations by a subtle desire to discredit every phase of the Revolution. This comes from the unhappy fact that in France the Revolution is still "in politics."

HENRY E. BOURNE.

Pitt: Some Chapters of his Life and Times. By the Right Hon. EDWARD GIBSON, Lord ASHBOURNE. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1898. Pp. xiv, 395.)

THIS work is rightly named "some chapters" in the life of Pitt. It is not a Life. The writer, Lord Ashbourne, the Chancellor of Ireland, has been a leading politician and is well qualified to give an opinion on any point of political history, especially when it relates, as the greater part of this volume does, to Irish affairs.

Pitt is a singular instance of a youth distinctly training himself for politics and turning out, without practical experience, a great politician. He went to Cambridge at fourteen and stayed there till he was twenty-one, leading a very studious and, during the earlier years, rather recluse life. Then entering Parliament, he at once took his place among the leaders; at twenty-three was a cabinet minister; and in his twenty-fifth year became prime minister and master of the House of Commons. He enjoyed the great heritage of his father's popularity, and he had been carefully trained by his father as a speaker. Curiously enough, he turned out the opposite of his father both as a statesman and as an orator. Chatham avowed himself a lover of honorable war; his glory was entirely warlike. He knew and cared little about economy or finance, and not much about general administration. His son was a disciple of Adam Smith, a financier, an economist, a lover of peace as the necessary condition of economical reform, and devoid of genius as a war minister. In his style of oratory also the pupil, though a success in his way, was the very opposite of his teacher. Chatham's style was in the highest degree original and electric. That of Pitt was in the strictest sense parliamentary. If any one wants to know what the perfection of British parliamentary eloquence is, let him read Pitt's speech of February 3, 1800, on the French overtures for peace. Fox's speech in reply, delivered immediately after Pitt had sat down, has been cited as a miracle of extem-

pore effort. It is a wonderful speech, but Fox may easily have anticipated some of Pitt's points, enough to prepare the greatest passages, especially that about the character of the Bourbons.

Pitt's extreme youth when he went to the head of affairs, instead of repelling national confidence, appealed strongly to the national heart. The country, as Lord Rosebery has pointed out, was weary of the factions, cabals, self-seeking, corruption, and incapacity of the aristocratic connections, and of the train of calamities ending in the loss of the American colonies which they had brought upon the nation. The appearance on the scene of the young son of Chatham was felt as a dawn of fresh hope. The drawback was a stiffness of manner, arising from want of intercourse in boyhood with youthful companions, which clung to Pitt through life and probably did him no good; though too much stress has been laid upon "magnetism" as a qualification for leadership. A party will follow a very unmagnetic leader whom it thoroughly trusts. No one could be less magnetic than Lord Grey or Sir Robert Peel. Lord Ashbourne proves that the dictator, so high and haughty to his political associates, could unbend and be charming in a circle of intimate friends. Pitt is playing a boisterous game with some boys when two cabinet ministers are announced. He washes his face, which the boys had been corking, receives the two ministers with imperial dignity, and when they have departed resumes the game. The story is given in Bruce's *Life of Sir William Napier*.

It appears from Lord Ashbourne's chapter on Pitt's boyhood and youth that Pitt's domestic affections were strong, and that he was highly susceptible of home joys. But having given himself up to public life, he never seriously thought of marriage till he was thirty-eight, when he fell in love with Eleanor Eden, the daughter of Lord Auckland, whose house was near Holwood, the scene of Pitt's lonely life. It has been commonly supposed that Auckland, whose character was far from noble, forbade the marriage on the ground that Pitt was unable to make a settlement. Unable to make a settlement Pitt certainly was; for though his official income was not less than ten thousand pounds a year, and he had no vices or expensive tastes, the great finance minister had so neglected his own financial affairs and had been so plundered by his household that he was deeply in debt. But letters published by Lord Ashbourne show that it was not the father but the lover who drew back. See especially Pitt's letter of withdrawal, January 20, 1797, penned in his usual majestic style (p. 243).

To this Auckland replies in a letter which Lord Ashbourne says has been lost, but which evidently pleaded for reconsideration, showing that Auckland desired the match. Pitt rejoins with a still more decisive letter of withdrawal, not explicitly stating, but leading us to believe that the state of his finances was the cause. "The circumstances," he says, "of every man's private and personal situation can often on various accounts be fully and fairly judged of by no one but himself; even where, as in the present case, others may be interested in the result." The por-

trait of Eleanor Eden given in Lord Ashbourne's volume is very attractive. The marriage might have improved Pitt's habits and prolonged his life.

Lord Ashbourne fully discusses the famous FitzWilliam episode, over which there has been so much wailing and malediction. The anti-Revolutionary Whigs under Portland had coalesced with Pitt and the Tories. They were inclined, in accordance with the traditions of their party, to introduce into Ireland a more liberal system than that of government by Castle influence and patronage, as well as to make concessions to the Catholics. Pitt's personal tendencies were in the same line. But the Cabinet being divided, and the King being known to be hostile to concession, it was necessary to go cautiously to work. So, Lord Ashbourne seems to prove, FitzWilliam, on his appointment as viceroy, was clearly advised. But FitzWilliam, with the best of intentions, went very far from cautiously to work. He prematurely divulged his appointment and proclaimed the great things which he was going to do. On his arrival in Ireland he at once announced a total change of system, proceeded to dismiss the managers of the old machine, and threw himself into the arms of their opponents, thereby bringing down at once a storm upon his government. He certainly seems, as Lord Ashbourne says, herein to have contravened his instructions. His conduct was condemned by Portland, the leader of his own party; it was condemned by Lord Carlisle, his close and warm ally, distinctly, though in a letter of the gentlest and kindest remonstrance. FitzWilliam proceeded further to justify his recall by the exhibition of a great want of self-control, and by the unwarrantable disclosure of a confidential document. The disappointment, however, to the Irish Catholics was severe, and the general effect of the affair was calamitous; though we may agree with Lord Ashbourne in doubting whether any concessions to the Catholics in 1795 would have averted the catastrophe of 1798. In the whole discussion and treatment of the Irish problem undue importance was attached to the question of the Catholic disabilities, and unwarranted hopes were founded on the effect to be produced by their removal. The grievances which the people felt most were the oppressively high rents and the tithes. Lord Ashbourne is probably right in thinking that they cared little whether their representatives in Parliament were Catholics or Protestants. The fact is that in comparison of security in their holdings the Irish people cared very little and still care very little about parliaments at all.

Lord Ashbourne also discusses the charge brought against Pitt of breach of faith towards the Catholics in failing to carry Catholic Emancipation after holding out the hope of it as an inducement to Catholics to acquiesce in the Union. In the late fight about Home Rule extreme Gladstonians went the length of insinuating that Pitt had been guilty of detestable treachery, secretly speculating, when he held out the hope to the Catholics, on the King's prejudice as a door of escape from a moral pledge. But this could be believed only by those who are capable of believing that Pitt got up the Irish Rebellion in order to provide himself

with a pretext for the Union. He had given no distinct pledge to Catholics, but he had unquestionably held out an expectation; and that expectation it was, not less unquestionably, his sincere desire to fulfill. Mr. Lecky, however, condemns him severely for his failure, and even Lord Ashbourne thinks that "he did not act in the matter like a strong man who meant to effect his purpose and who would not be denied." Lord Ashbourne suggests that Pitt's health was failing, and that he had lost some of the energy and decision of early days. That Pitt's health was failing is not doubtful. The port wine with which the family physician, Dr. Addington, had taught him to drench himself was doing its work, as had the colchicum with which the same medical adviser treated Chatham. But Pitt had strength enough several years afterwards to carry on the government and form a great coalition against Napoleon. There was another sort of weakness, not physical but political, which perhaps ought to be taken into account. Pitt owed the premiership in the first instance to a flagrant abuse of the royal influence, which was condoned by the nation from hatred of the coalition. This could hardly fail to weigh upon his mind whenever he was called upon to wrestle with the prejudices of the King. His intention was to follow up the Union not only with Catholic Emancipation but with the commutation of tithe and a provision for the Catholic clergy. But he had difficulty with his cabinet as well as with the King. That difficulty he seems to have judged it best first to overcome, that he might go to the King in the name of a unanimous cabinet. But he was betrayed by his Chancellor, the sycophant Loughborough, who, hoping to secure the King's favor for himself, disclosed Pitt's intention, and with the pious aid of two archbishops so bedevilled the half-insane conscience of his master that when Pitt approached the King the case was hopeless. Pitt paid the debt of honor by resignation. What more could he do? He could not give the King brains or sanity. He could not dethrone him, or deprive him of his legislative veto. George, moreover, had the decided sympathy of all the folly, ignorance, and bigotry of the nation on his side. Addington's administration was anti-Catholic, and Pitt is blamed for having supported it. But the Catholic question was secondary; the main question was the French war, in the midst of which the nation could not be left without a government. Pitt took a more questionable step when, a fit of the King's insanity having been brought on by the agitation, he spontaneously pledged himself not to moot the question of Catholic Emancipation again in the King's life-time. But as Lord Ashbourne says, there was at that time strong reason for believing that the King would not live long, and in the meantime Pitt did not, of course, renounce his chance of prevailing by persuasion, which would have been improved by this touching mark of consideration. To demand that when the war with Napoleon had been renewed and Addington's incompetence had become manifest, Pitt should refuse to answer to the call of the imperilled nation because he would not be able to proceed with a secondary measure, surely would have been preposterous. On that question the mind of the nation at all events was clear.

Lord Ashbourne has dealt with the previous Irish policy of Pitt, his efforts to bring about parliamentary reform and to give Ireland free trade in England. Pitt was evidently animated throughout by the same liberal spirit. That he was not so strong a man or so resolute in facing difficulties as has been commonly supposed is likely enough. But he was certainly incapable of perfidy and probably as little likely as any man who has ever held power can be, to be led away from the path of honor by the love of place.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

Bismarck: Some Secret Pages of His History. Being a Diary kept by Dr. MORITZ BUSCH during twenty-five years' official and private Intercourse with the Great Chancellor. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1898. Two vols., pp. xix, 504; viii, 585.)

PRINCESS BISMARCK, who, like most wives, gave her husband shrewd advice, warned the Prince of the dangers that lurked in Moritz Busch's ink-bottle. "The doctor," said she, "may be very clever and amiable, but all the same you should be on your guard at table when he is present. He always sits there with his ears cocked, writes everything down, and then spreads it abroad." Bismarck, however, knew very well the quality of Busch's literary gossip and was willing to stamp it with his official approval. In November, 1878, Dr. Busch published a book called *Count Bismarck and His People*, the important portions of which are incorporated in the work now before us. Bismarck himself revised the manuscript, and, after it was printed, told Busch that it would give fools the impression that Bismarck was a bitter, censorious, envious creature, unable to bear the vicinity of any greatness. Nevertheless, at the close of the same conversation, Bismarck told his Boswell "as soon as I am dead you can say whatever you like, everything you know." The Prince gave to Busch the use of important papers, and said, "One day long after my death Bueschlein will write the secret history of our times from good sources." The doctor declared to the Prince, "I have always regarded myself as your little archer, who at your call would even shoot my bolt at the sun himself." The reader, therefore, may study these volumes with some assurance that the portrait of Bismarck therein contained is authentic as far as it goes.

There are in these memoirs three clearly distinct groups of materials of uneven value. First are the constantly recurring abstracts of the articles written by Busch, mostly at Bismarck's own dictation, for sundry newspapers at home and abroad.

The period of Dr. Busch's greatest activity as confidential secretary was from 1870 to 1873, but he continued to help Bismarck "tune the newspapers," especially after April, 1877, until the latter's retirement in 1890. These "inspired" editorials, once delivered to the public through the mouthpieces of the imperial government, relate to every